

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the above-referenced application is respectively requested in view of the above amendments and these remarks. Claims 1-20 and 25-33 are currently pending.

In the Office Action, claims 1-2, 12-13 and 25-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent No. 6,138,030 to Coombes et al. in view of United States Patent No. 5,913,166 to Buttitta et al. Applicants have amended claims 1-2, 12-13 and 25-26 to overcome the rejection. In particular, Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 12 and 25 to indicate that the first and second communication networks are a Wireless Local Area Network and a Wireless Wide Area Network. In claim 12, these networks are coupled via a public switched network. In addition, claims 1, 12 and 25 are amended to include that the active call is in the first communication network and the call leg is in the second communication network.

Applicants have previously described and persuasively argued the difference between the claims and Buttitta. Coombes is directed to a communications system infrastructure, such as an integrated services radio system, that is provided with a hold processor. The hold processor is operably coupled to at least one base station controller. If a mobile subscriber unit is actively engaged in a first communication service, such as a telephone interconnect call, and desires to use a second communication service, such as making or responding to a dispatch call, the mobile subscriber unit request the first service to be held. The base station controller then switches the first service to the hold server, which in turn generates an identifier for transmittal to the mobile subscriber unit for storage and call retrieval at a later time.

Coombes discloses a coupled interconnect network and a dispatch network, while the claims are directed to a loosely coupled Wireless Local Area Network and Wireless Wide Area Network. Not only are these networks different but there are significant differences between the disclosed connections found in Coombes and the claimed loosely coupled networks. In addition, Coombes is directed on an on-hold call that is established in first communication network and the call is handed over to again become an on-hold

call in the first communication network. Applicant's amendment to the claims make clear that the on-hold call is established in the first communication network and handed over to become an on-hold call in the second communication network and that is done using a call leg in the second communication network. Coombes does not disclose, teach or otherwise suggest, among other things, that the call leg is in the second communication network and that the on-hold call is operating in the second communication network. Buttitta also does not disclose, teach or otherwise suggest the claimed networks, the call leg on the second communication network and that the on-hold call is operating on the second communication network.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit claims 1, 12 and 25 are patentable over the combination of Coombes and Buttitta. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejection under Section 103(a) be withdrawn. As claims 2, 13 and 26 depended upon allowable claims 1, 12, and 25, Applicants also request that the rejection under Section 103(a) to these claims be withdrawn.

Claims 3-11, 14-19 and 27-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coombes in view of Buttitta as applied to claims 1, 12 and 25 and further in view of United States Patent No. 6,633,635 B2 to Kung et al. As stated above, Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 12, and 25 upon which claims 3-11, 14-19 and 27-31 depend, respectively. Applicants have also amended claims 6, 8-11, 14-19 and 27-31 to clarify the claims and to conform to claims 1, 12 and 25. Thus, each and every limitation of independent claims 1, 12 and 25, including the limitation that a call is placed on-hold prior to the determination that a hand out is required, are a part of these rejected claims. Kung has been previously described and does not disclose, teach or otherwise suggest the claimed networks, the claimed call-leg in the second communication network and the on-hold call being in the second communication network.

In addition and as stated previously, there is a fundamental difference between a call in a call waiting state and an on-hold state because the on-hold call has been accepted by the wireless communication while the call-waiting call has not been completed by the wireless communication unit. Thus, there is nothing to suggest that what is taught by Kung is relevant to the issues of handoff of on-hold calls in loosely

coupled systems, and there is no reason to combine the references as suggested in the Office Action.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that the combination of Coombes, Buttitta and Kung does not disclose, teach, discuss or otherwise suggest what is claimed in claims 3-11, 14-19 and 27-31. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that claims 3-11, 14-19 and 27-31 are patentable and non-obvious over Buttitta in view of Kung. Applicants request that this rejection under Section 103(a) be withdrawn.

In the Office Action, claims 19 and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coombes and Buttitta as applied to claims 12-13 and 25-26 and further in view of well known prior art. Applicants have amended independent claims 12 and 25 upon which claims 19 and 32 depend, respectively. Thus, each and every limitation of independent claims 12 and 25 are included in these rejected claims. The known prior art cited in the Office Action does not disclose, teach, discuss or otherwise suggest the claimed network, the on call leg being on the second communication network and the on-hold call being in the second communication network. For these reasons and those given above, Applicants therefore respectfully submit that claims 19 and 32 are patentable and non-obvious over the cited combination. Applicants request that this rejection under Section 103(a) be withdrawn.

Claims 20 and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coombes in view of Buttitta as applied to claims 12-13 and 25-26 above in view of well known prior art as applied in claims 19 and 32, and further in view of Kung. Applicants have amended independent claims 12 and 25 upon which claims 20 and 33 depend, respectively. Thus, each and every limitation of independent claims 12 and 25 are included in these rejected claims. For these reasons and the reasons explained above with respect to the other claims, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 20 and 33 are patentable and non-obvious over the cited combination. Applicants request that this rejection under Section 103(a) be withdrawn.

As the Applicants have overcome all substantive rejections and objections given by the Examiner and have complied with all requests properly presented by the Examiner, the Applicants contend that this Amendment, with the above discussion, overcomes the Examiner's objections to and rejections of the pending claims. Therefore,

Serial No. 10/725,661

Segal et al

Case No. CE12199N

the Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of the application. If the Examiner is of the opinion that any issues regarding the status of the claims remain after this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned representative to expedite resolution of the matter.

Please charge any fees associated herewith, including extension of time fees, to **50-2117**.

Respectfully submitted,
Segal, Niranjana N. et al.

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Motorola, Inc.
Law Department

Customer Number: **22917**

By: /Simon B. Anolick/

Simon B. Anolick
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No.: 37,585
Telephone: 847-576-4234
Fax: 847-576-3750